R 5685-P

Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980

Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980

Gary Orfield

Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C. 1983

The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national nonprofit institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs.

Opinions expressed in Joint Center publications are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the other staff, officers, or governors of the Joint Center or of the organizations supporting the center and its research.

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, which helped to make this publication possible.

This volume was rendered into type by telephone transmissions of electronic files to the WORD/SMITHS TELECOMMUNICATIONS TYPESETTING COMPANY at Washington, D.C.

ISBN 0-941410-29-3

Copyright © 1983 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Joint Center for Political Studies
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004

Contents

List of Tables		vii
Foreword		ix
Preface		xi
1.	Regional Trends in School Desegregation	1
2.	The Cities and School Segregation	22
3.	Metropolitan Desegregation Patterns	36
4.	Conclusions and Recommendations	48
Appendix A.	School Segregation, by State, 1980	51
Appendix B.	Percentage of White and Black Enrollment, Largest School Districts, 1968-80	53
Appendix C.	Technical Notes	57
Notes		59
References		61

Tables

1. Percentage of U.S.black students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, 1968-80. 4
2. Percentage of black students in predominantly minority and nearly all-minority schools, by region, 1968-80. 4
3. Increase in percentage of black students attending majority white schools, border and southern states, 1968-80. 6
4. Percentage of black students in schools more than 50 percent white, by state, 1968 and 1980. 8
5. States with largest black enrollment and highest levels of segregation of black students according to three measures, 1980. 10
6. Percentage of white students in the school of a typical black student, by state, 1970 and 1980(in states with at least 5 percent black students). 11
7. Percentage of white students in school attended by typical black student, by region, 1970 and 1980. 13
8. Percentage of black students in school attended by typical white student, by region, 1970 and 1980. 13
9. Percentage of white students in schools 90 to 100 percent white, by region, 1968-80. 13
10. Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, 1968-80. 14
11. Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, by region, 1968-80 14
12. Percentage of white students in school attended by typical Hispanic student, by region, 1970 and 1980. 16
13. Percentage of Hispanic students in school attended by typical white student, by region, 1970 and 1980. 16

14. Percentage of Hispanic students in schools more than 50 percent white, by state, 1968 and 1980. 17
15. States with largest Hispanic enrollment, 1980. 18
16. States with largest Hispanic enrollment and highest levels of segregation of Hispanic students according to three measures, 1980. 18
17. Percentage of white students in the school of a typical Hispanic student, by state, 1970 and 1980 (in states with at least 5 percent Hispanic students). 19
18. Racial composition of public school enrollment, by region, 1970 and 1980. 21
19. Decline in enrollment of white students in selected large-city school districts, 1968-80. 24
20. Total enrollment and racial composition of the fifty largest central-city school districts, 1980. 26
21. Percentage of white enrollment in the largest school districts in the southern and border states, 1968-80. 28
22. Percentage of Hispanic enrollment in selected large districts, 1968, 1980, and 1982. 31
23. Change in the percentage of white students in the school of the typical black student, by city, 1968-80. 33
24. Integration levels for black and Hispanic students in largest surveyed metropolitan areas in southern and border states, 1980. 41
25. Changes in integration levels for black and Hispanic students in the largest surveyed metropolitan areas in the southern and border states, 1970-80. 42
26. Segregation of black students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 5 percent black 1970-80. 45
27. Segregation of Hispanic students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 10 percent Hispanic, 1970-80. 46

Foreword

Since the fall of 1981, the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights has been conducting extensive hearings and studies of school desegregation in the United States. Chairman Don Edwards requested that the U.S. Department of Education supply the subcommittee with primary data on the levels of segregation of black and Hispanic public school students. These data, covering the period from 1968—when systematic federal data were first collected—to the 1980-81 school year, were provided in the form of printouts prepared by the DBS Corporation and additional data from the Department of Education. Chairman Edwards then requested that the Joint Center for Political Studies analyze the data and report to the committee on their implications.

This volume contains the Joint Center's response to that request. It was prepared by Gary Orfield, professor of political science, public policy, and education at the University of Chicago, and JCPS adjunct fellow. He performed much of the analysis as part of his research for a book on metropolitan segregation for the Twentieth Century Fund. The fund paid for the computer time used to analyze the Education Department data. The University of Chicago provided some research assistance for the project. Professor Orfield has written extensively on school desegregation, notably *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy* (1978) and *Toward a Strategy for Urban Integration* (1981).

This report provides answers to two fundamental questions: How segregated are America's public schools today? How much progress have we made since the sixties?

The contents of this volume were released, in preliminary form, in two parts. The first part, released in September 1982, contained the analysis of the broad national and regional trends in the desegregation of black and Hispanic students. The second part, released in January 1983, focused on

states, metropolitan areas, and large cities. Those preliminary reports released figures on school segregation for 1980. And this study represents the first time that federal racial data for schools *on a metropolitan level* have ever been released.

This report was prepared with the assistance of Michael O'Grady of the U.S. Department of Education; Nancy O'Connor, research assistant at the Brookings Institution; and Helene Kim, research assistant at the University of Chicago.

April 1983

Eddie N. Williams
President

Preface

It is now more than fourteen years since the Supreme Court rejected gradual voluntary transfers between black and white schools and called for root-and-branch desegregation. Almost a decade has passed since the first Supreme Court decision requiring citywide busing outside the South. But the national debate over school desegregation continues to be intense. We are experiencing another national attack on court-ordered desegregation by national leaders, including the president and the attorney general. The federal grant program supporting desegregation was repealed in 1981 and there are numerous proposals in Congress to limit the use of busing for desegregation. At the same time, in courtrooms across the country, civil rights groups continue to wage protracted legal battles against segregation.

Some say that desegregation has changed the face of southern education, while others describe it as a futile, self-defeating struggle. In the heat of the debate, we seldom stop to assess where we are and in what direction we are moving in the quest for integrated schools. I hope that the data reported here can help provide such an assessment and clarify the real issues that remain before us.

There are many complex and subtle questions about desegregation, some of which simply cannot be answered given the present state of knowledge. The question whether students in a given part of the country are attending schools that are more segregated or less segregated than they were a few years ago, however, is no longer one of those questions. This report answers that question on the basis of enrollment data from across the country, which the U.S. government has gathered for over a decade but has not systematically analyzed. The data provide some dramatic findings.

There are both startling successes and dismal failures in the efforts for school desegregation. Different regions, states, and metropolitan areas have widely varying patterns of segregation and integration. In some,

desegregated education has been the norm for years; in others, segregation is as bad as ever or is becoming even more severe. Our big central cities, in most parts of the country, operate public schools that are basically minority institutions.

At a time when it is fashionable to say that governmental remedies for any serious social problem are ineffectual, the statistics in this report suggest that some desegregation policies have in fact succeeded. The most far-reaching plans appear to have the most positive and long-lasting effects.

These statistics, of course, will not resolve the debates. They may help, however, to encourage more research on the real issues and effects. They show, I believe, that we can achieve desegregated education if we want to. They show profound and lasting change in the region where enforcement has been concentrated, the South. They also show, however, a widespread and ominous increase in the isolation of Hispanic students, a situation that has received little serious study and no sustained initiative for change. The real question now is whether or not those of us who live in the major centers of contemporary segregation—the great cities of the North and the West—will learn from the successes elsewhere or will continue to ignore the issue and dismiss the possibility of change.

My interest in these data grew out of a large study of metropolitan segregation I am preparing for the Twentieth Century Fund. These data were essential to answering some of the questions posed in that study, and funds from that project supported some of the computations in this report. I would like to express my appreciation to the Fund and to Milton Morris and Catherine Iino of the Joint Center for their assistance on this project.

March 1983 Gary Orfield

Chapter 1

Regional Trends in School Desegregation

The history of desegregation in the United States so far can be divided into three periods. The first began in 1954, when the Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated school systems were "inherently unequal" and that when segregation stems from state laws, those laws must be struck down as unconstitutional.[1] What followed was a period of gradual, hard-fought change in the eleven states of the South and the six border states that had been segregated by law.[2] Many districts adopted "freedom of choice" plans, which maintained separate schools but allowed black students to transfer to white schools.

This period ended in 1968, when the Supreme Court required rural southern school districts to adopt desegregation plans that would do away with racially identifiable schools (*Greene* v. *County School Board of New Kent County*). A year later the Court declared that the time for gradualism was over, and that southern districts must correct violations immediately (*Alexander* v. *Holmes*). The Court continued its pressure with a 1971 decision that busing could be used as a means to overcome the continuing effects of decades of legally enforced segregation (*Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*).

The third phase began in 1973, when desegregation moved out of the South and into the North and West. In that year, the Court ruled, in a case involving Denver, that if official actions had kept a substantial part of a school system racially segregated, the courts could presume that the entire system had been segregated (unless the school district could prove its innocence) and could order remedies affecting the entire system. This decision covered such actions as building new schools or placing mobile

units in all-black districts instead of assigning black students to mostly white schools nearby—actions that often had been taken even in places where no laws had required segregation (*Keyes* v. *School District No. 1*). The decision opened the door to suits in many cities outside the South, but it and subsequent decisions also led to an upsurge in opposition to desegregation orders in places that had previously seemed exempt from court action.

A number of cases since 1973 have involved official actions in cities where large and increasing proportions of students are black; a few involve areas with large proportions of Hispanic students. But the high minority enrollment in many central-city districts and the barriers to suburban involvement created by the Supreme Court's 1974 decision against city-suburban desegregation in Detroit (*Milliken* v. *Bradley*) have created special difficulties in achieving integrated education.

This history is reflected in the data on levels of segregation that have been gathered since 1968 by the federal government. These data allow comparisons to be made over time, from region to region, and from state to state, and from city to city.

This report uses three measures to determine the degree to which schools are desegregated:

1. What percentage of black or Hispanic students attend schools that are predominantly minority? "Predominantly" means that 50 percent or more of the school's students are from minority groups.
2. What percentage of black or Hispanic students attend schools that are between 90 and 100 percent minority?
3. What is the percentage of white students in the school of a typical black or Hispanic student? (This is referred to as the "exposure rate," and is explained in Appendix C.)

For both black and Hispanic students, the minority percentage usually refers overwhelmingly to the percentage of students from their own group since Asians make up only a small percentage of the enrollment in all but a few districts and attend predominantly white schools. Hispanics and blacks are highly segregated from each other in most school districts. The southern and border states (except Texas and South Florida) have few Hispanics.

One frequently used measure, the "dissimilarity index," was not used. This index measures the extent to which each school reflects the overall racial proportions of the geographical unit analyzed. It is a misleading measure for central cities since it would show perfect desegregation both for a 95 percent black school in a 95 percent black district and a 40 percent black school in a 40 percent district, though few would consider the first school integrated. It is a good measure on a metropolitan basis but the Education Department did not collect the data necessary to use it.

The measures used allow us to talk about the degree of segregation in one school system compared with that in another and to discern changes in the

degree of segregation in a particular place over time. If, for example, we find in one city that a large percentage of black students (say 75 percent or more) attend schools that are more than 90 percent black, we can confidently conclude that the city's school system is intensely segregated. My use of the term "segregated" is, therefore, grounded in statistical fact and not in any judgment as to whether a school system took any official action that resulted in segregated schools. Regardless of its causes, the fact of segregation is a matter of concern if we are to avoid becoming not just two nations, black and white, but perhaps three nations—black, white, and Hispanic.

This chapter focuses on changes since 1968 by region (see Appendix C), first for black students and then for Hispanic students. Later chapters discuss the special situations of large cities, and examine some metropolitan areas for which areawide data are available.

DESEGREGATION OF BLACK STUDENTS

The data show the following basic trends in the level of segregation of black students in the nation's public schools between 1968 and 1980.

- Nationwide, segregation of black students in public schools declined significantly between 1968 and 1980 (see Table 1). The drop was sharpest in the percentage of black students attending the most severely segregated schools—those between 90 and 100 percent minority. But despite this decrease, segregation was still substantial in 1980: Nearly one-third of black students attended almost all-minority schools, and more than three out of five attended schools that were predominantly (more than half) minority. Moreover, the momentum of desegregation may be slowing, as shown by the slight increase in the percentage of black students attending predominantly minority schools between 1978 (61.8 percent) and 1980 (62.9 percent).
- The most substantial decreases in segregation of black students came in the South and the border states. The eleven states of the South had the lowest level of segregation of any region in 1980 (see Table 2).
- The Northeast was the only region in which segregation of black students *increased* and, in 1980, had the highest level of any region. Nearly half (48.7 percent) of black students in the region attended almost all-minority schools in 1980, compared with less than a quarter (23 percent) of black students in the South.
- All other regions showed decreases in segregation, although the midwest in 1980 was significantly more segregated than the nation as a whole.

Table 1. Percentage of U.S. black students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, 1968-80.

Year	Predominantly minority	90%-100% minority
1968	76.6	64.3
1970	66.9	44.3
1972	63.6	38.7
1974	63.0	37.8
1976	62.4	35.9
1978	61.8	34.2
1980	62.9	33.2

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 2. Percentage of black students in predominantly minority and nearly all-minority schools, by region, 1968-80.

Area	Percentage				Percentage point change, 1968-80
	1968	1972	1976	1980	
PERCENTAGE IN PREDOMINANTLY MINORITY SCHOOLS*					
South	80.9	55.3	54.9	57.1	−23.8
Border	71.6	67.2	60.1	59.2	−12.4
Northeast	66.8	69.9	72.5	79.9	+13.1
Midwest	77.3	75.3	70.3	69.5	− 7.8
West	72.2	68.1	67.4	66.8	− 5.4
U.S. average	76.6	63.6	62.4	62.9	−13.7
PERCENTAGE IN 90%-100% MINORITY SCHOOLS					
South	77.8	24.7	22.4	23.0	−54.8
Border	60.2	54.7	42.5	37.0	−23.2
Northeast	42.7	46.9	51.4	48.7	+ 6.0
Midwest	58.0	57.4	51.1	43.6	−14.4
West	50.8	42.7	36.3	33.7	−17.1
U.S. average	64.3	38.7	35.9	33.2	−31.1

* "Predominantly" minority means 50 percent or more minority; "nearly all-minority" means 90 to 100 percent minority.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

The Southern and Border States

The data strongly suggest that the progress toward integration in the southern and border states was related to a strong enforcement effort by the federal government and the federal courts, which was primarily directed at southern segregation. When President Kennedy asked Congress to enact a civil rights bill in 1963, 98 percent of black students in the South were in all-black schools, and almost all whites attended white schools. Enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and a number of major court decisions on southern segregation cut the proportion of southern black students in all-minority schools to 25 percent by 1968.[3] Between 1968 and 1972, when the most dramatic changes occured, the Supreme Court issued its decisions in *Alexander* v. *Holmes* and *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg.* As noted earlier, these decisions required that southern districts desegregate immediately and authorized the use of busing when it was the only way desegregation could be accomplished. These decisions immediately affected hundreds of districts and sharply decreased segregation of black and white students in the South.

The dramatic changes over the entire region, however, do not tell the whole story. Among the states in this region, which are subject to the same general legal requirements, desegregation has occurred in very diverse ways and has had strikingly different results. Increases in the percentages of black students attending majority-white schools ranged from 0 to 41 percent during the period studied. Three of the states today have more than nine-tenths of their black students in integrated schools; one state has more than three-fourths of its black children in predominantly minority schools, and five others have about two-thirds of their black pupils in such schools.

Table 3 shows that the largest increases in integration have taken place in Delaware, Kentucky, and Florida, each of which had begun to desegregate at the beginning of the period and made decisive increases in integration during the seventies. The increases are clearly related to countywide busing plans, encompassing both central cities and surrounding suburban areas. Such plans were implemented in many Florida districts in 1971 and implemented in metropolitan Wilmington and Louisville, under federal court orders, later in the decade. At the other end of the spectrum, with the lowest gains and continuing high levels of segregation of black students, are several states and the District of Columbia. In these places, very large numbers of black students attend separate central-city district schools that enroll relatively few white students and have limited desegregation plans or none at all. The District of Columbia obviously has an unique situation because white enrollment in the city is negligible and all the suburbs are in the states of Maryland and Virginia.

Three of the southern and border states have shown some significant *increases* in the percentages of black students in intensely segregated

Table 3: Increase in percentage of black students attending majority white schools, border and southern states, 1968-80.

State	Increase in percentage of state's black students in predominantly white schools, 1968-80	Percentage of black students in predominantly white schools, 1980
Delaware	40.9	95.1
Kentucky	37.4	91.1
Florida	37.1	60.3
Alabama	36.0	44.3
North Carolina	35.7	64.0
Oklahoma	27.9	65.7
South Carolina	25.9	40.1
Georgia	25.9	39.9
Louisiana	25.3	34.2
Arkansas	19.6	42.2
Mississippi	16.9	23.6
Tennessee	15.5	36.7
Virginia	15.4	42.3
West Virginia	12.5	94.5
Missouri	11.8	36.4
Texas	10.8	36.0
Maryland	1.7	32.8
District of Columbia	0.0	0.9
Total, South	23.8	42.9
Total, Border	12.4	40.8
National Total	13.7	37.1

Note: The states of the South are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The border states are Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia; the District of Columbia is also included in this region.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

schools since 1974. From 1974 to 1980, the percentages of black students in schools that were 90 to 100 percent minority rose by 9.4 percentage points in Tennessee, 5.0 percentage points in Florida, and 4.3 percentage points in Mississippi. These changes indicate the need to update desegregation plans periodically to deal with the growth of segregated residential patterns, if the accomplishments of the last generation are to be consolidated. Many plans have not been reviewed for a decade or more.

The Northern and Western States

The problem of segregation for blacks today is centered in the large, older industrial states and in large cities that have experienced major racial change. Elsewhere considerable progress has taken place. Although a number of court cases have involved cities in the North (including the regions of the Northeast and Midwest) and the West, neither the Supreme Court nor the executive branch has issued directives for desegregation in these regions that are as clear and unambiguous as the court decisions regarding southern schools.

State-by-state data for 1980 show that in twenty states more than three black students out of every four attended a school that was majority white (see Table 4). Most of these states had very few students in segregated schools. These data show that no serious segregation problem exists in many areas of the country, either because these areas have few minority children or because states have already eliminated segregation. In a word, segregation is not a nationwide problem; it is concentrated in a few states.

The Northeast is the most segregated region and has become more segregated during the seventies, because black students there are concentrated in large, predominantly nonwhite school districts that have never been ordered to implement a major desegregation plan, even within the central city. In other cases, orders came when there were relatively few whites remaining in city schools.

In fourteen states and the District of Columbia, at least 30 percent of black students are in schools that have 90 to 100 percent minority students. These states can be grouped into five areas:

— Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut
— Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, and Michigan
— Washington, D.C., and Maryland
— Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas
— California

The problem is that many of the states with serious segregation remaining are those with the largest percentages of minority children. Most black students attend schools in just nine states: New York, Texas, Illinois,

Table 4. Percentage of black students in schools more than 50 percent white, by state, 1968 and 1980.

State	Black enrollment, 1980	Percentage of black students in predominately white schools		Percentage point change, 1968-80
		1968	1980	
New York	484,286	32.31	23.26	− 9.05
Texas	408,747	25.25	36.01	10.76
Illinois	403,061	13.62	20.55	6.93
California	400,675	22.49	24.67	2.18
Georgia	359,888	14.03	39.89	25.86
Florida	348,768	23.21	60.35	37.14
North Carolina	329,724	28.31	64.04	35.73
Louisiana	322,985	8.89	34.21	25.32
Michigan	314,204	20.60	18.14	− 2.46
South Carolina	262,110	14.19	40.12	25.93
Virginia	257,657	26.90	42.27	15.37
Alabama	249,734	8.29	44.28	35.99
Ohio	249,485	27.74	41.14	13.40
Maryland	231,590	31.11	32.78	1.67
Pennsylvania	231,331	27.52	29.27	1.75
Mississippi	228,251	6.71	23.56	16.85
New Jersey	226,814	33.88	23.29	−10.56
Tennessee	204,014	21.25	36.73	15.48
Missouri	113,357	24.56	36.35	11.79
Indiana	102,317	29.98	38.14	8.16
District of Columbia	97,962	0.90	0.91	0.01
Arkansas	92,227	22.61	42.17	19.56
Kentucky	59,611	53.72	91.12	37.40
Massachusetts	56,675	51.24	43.99	− 7.25
Connecticut	53,943	43.32	42.06	− 1.26
Wisconsin	50,740	22.54	46.54	24.00
Oklahoma	48,173	37.81	65.71	27.90
Kansas	29,159	53.44	70.96	17.52
Washington	25,989	64.23	76.38	12.15
Colorado	25,203	30.52	53.05	22.53
Delaware	24,900	54.23	95.14	40.91
Arizona	20,346	33.41	43.82	10.41
Minnesota	16,763	78.97	94.48	15.51
West Virginia	14,747	82.03	94.50	12.47
Nebraska	13,434	27.26	78.21	50.95
Iowa	11,446	73.11	96.65	23.54
Oregon	9,482	63.26	75.11	11.85
Rhode Island	6,642	89.42	77.10	−12.32
New Mexico	5,927	47.94	58.07	10.13

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

California, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Louisana, and Michigan. As Table 5 shows, Illinois, New York, Michigan, and New Jersey head the list in segregation of blacks on all three of the measures used in this study. California, Pennsylvania, and Louisiana are also among the most segregated on all three measures, while Texas is among the most segregated on two of the measures. Thus, of the states where most black students are concentrated *and* where segregation remains serious, all but two are in the North and West.

None of the most segregated northern and western states is among the ten states with the highest overall percentage of black students in total state enrollment. The southern states, with considerably higher proportions of blacks, have less segregated school systems. Southern and border-state urban districts are far more likely to be under court order and, on average, they contain a substantially larger fraction of the metropolitan-area population than in northern areas, where city districts were cut off much earlier by separate suburbs. (Florida, for example, has countywide districts.)

Many states in the North and West have small black populations. Among the states in these regions in which at least 5 percent of the students are black, only six made substantial advances in the desegregation of black students between 1970 and 1980: Nebraska, Wisconsin, Ohio, Nevada, Indiana, and Kansas (see Table 6). In two other northern states showing significant changes—New York and New Jersey—schools became more segregated during the 1970s.

Outside the South, the states with the largest gains in desegregation are those in which black students are concentrated in one or a few urban centers *and* where there have been major court orders requiring urban desegregation.

- In Nebraska, the Omaha court order ended most segregated education in the state.
- In Wisconsin, most blacks live in Milwaukee, and a court-ordered desegregation process emphasizing magnet schools significantly reduced segregation.
- Ohio has been the scene of very active litigation; major court orders have been issued in Cleveland, Columbus, and Dayton, and a voluntary plan has been put into effect in Cincinnati.
- Blacks in Nevada are concentrated in the Las Vegas area, where a metropolitan plan was implemented.
- Indiana has had major court-ordered desegregation in Indianapolis.
- Plans in Minneapolis, Denver, and Seattle lowered black segregation in states with small percentages of black students.

In New Jersey and New York, the only states where black segregation has increased significantly, some successful efforts have been made to desegregate small cities and the suburbs of large cities, but no significant desegregation plans have been implemented in New York City, Newark,

Table 5. States with largest black enrollment and highest levels of segregation of black students according to three measures, 1980.

Rank	Black percentage of total enrollment	Percentage of black students in predominantly minority schools	Percentage of black students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of white students in school of typical black student *
1.	Mississippi	Michigan	Illinois	Illinois
2.	South Carolina	Illinois	New York	Michigan
3.	Louisiana	New York	Michigan	New York
4.	Georgia	New Jersey	New Jersey	New Jersey
5.	Alabama	Mississippi	Pennsylvania	Georgia
6.	Maryland	California	Missouri	Mississippi
7.	North Carolina	Pennsylvania	California	Pennsylvania
8.	Delaware	Maryland	Louisiana	Louisiana
9.	Virginia	Louisiana	Mississippi	Missouri
10.	Tennessee	Texas	Indiana	Texas

* Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, Illinois has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical black. See Appendix D for an explanation of this measure.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 6. Percentage of white students in the school of a typical black student, by state, 1970 and 1980 (in states with at least 5 percent black students).

State	Percentage black enrollment	Percentage of white students in school of typical black student		Percentage point change, 1970-80
		1970	1980	
Nebraska	5.6	32.6	65.5	32.9
Kentucky	8.7	49.4	74.3	24.9
Delaware	25.9	46.5	68.5	22.0
Wisconsin	6.2	25.7	44.5	18.8
Oklahoma	9.3	42.1	57.6	15.5
Ohio	13.1	28.4	43.2	14.8
Missouri	13.6	21.4	34.1	12.7
Nevada	9.5	55.7	68.4	12.7
Tennessee	24.0	29.2	38.0	8.8
Indiana	9.9	31.1	38.7	7.6
Kansas	7.8	51.6	59.1	7.5
Florida	23.4	43.2	50.6	7.4
Alabama	33.1	32.7	39.7	7.0
Virginia	25.5	41.5	47.4	5.9
Maryland	30.6	30.3	35.4	5.1
North Carolina	29.6	49.0	54.0	5.0
Texas	14.4	30.7	35.2	4.5
Illinois	20.9	14.6	19.0	4.4
Arkansas	22.5	42.5	46.5	4.0
Georgia	33.5	35.1	38.3	3.2
Massachusetts	6.2	47.5	50.4	2.9
California	10.1	25.6	27.7	2.1
Louisiana	41.5	30.8	32.8	2.0
South Carolina	42.8	41.2	42.7	1.5
Pennsylvania	12.4	27.8	29.3	1.5
Michigan	17.9	21.9	22.5	0.6
Mississippi	51.0	29.6	29.2	− 0.4
District of Columbia	93.4	2.2	1.5	− 0.7
Connecticut	10.2	44.1	40.3	−3.8
New Jersey	18.5	32.4	26.4	− 6.0
New York	17.9	29.2	23.0	− 6.2

Note: See Appendix D for an explanation of this measure.
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

and other large New Jersey cities. Segregation has increased primarily because of the rapid declines in whites in the central-city school districts and the steady spread of ghettos and barrios to cover more and more of the central cities.

Not only black students but whites as well were far more likely to attend substantially integrated schools in the South than in the North. To be sure, the North and West had far smaller proportions of black students to integrate (27 percent of students in the South were black; 18 percent in the border states; 14 percent in the Northeast; 12 percent in the Midwest; and 7 percent in the West). But even taking these disparities into account, the North and West seem to be doing much less to achieve integregation.

For the nation as a whole, the average percentage of white students in the school attended by a typical black student rose by 4.2 percentage points between 1970 and 1980. The rise for the South was greater than the national average, while the figure for the Northeast showed a decline (see Table 7).

Similarly, the percentage of black students in the school attended by the typical white student rose faster in the South than in the nation as a whole, while in the Northeast the figure was virtually unchanged (see Table 8).

In the South, the percentage of white public school students in schools that were 90 to 100 percent white declined from 71 percent in 1968 to 36 percent in 1980. During the same period, there was virtually no change in the Northeast and a much smaller change in the Midwest. Southern white students are growing up in schools where minority students are a major presence, but many white children in the Northeast and Midwest are severely isolated from nonwhite children. Almost a fifth of the children in the school of the typical southern white are black, but less than one-twentieth of the children in the school of the typical northern or western white students are black. Only one-third of southern white children, as contrasted with more than four-fifths of whites in the Northeast and Midwest, attend highly segregated white schools with less than one-tenth minority students (see Table 9).

SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS

In contrast to the desegregation picture for black students, which is full of complexities and crosscurrents, the picture for Hispanic students is clear and uniform: segregation rose sharply during the seventies. Nationwide figures show steady increases from 1968 to 1980 in the percentage of Hispanic students attending predominantly minority schools (from 55 percent to 68 percent) and 90 to 100 percent minority schools (from 23 percent to 29 percent), as shown in Table 10. Segregation of Hispanics has grown in every region of the country (Table 11).

This development has received relatively little attention, as most legal efforts to combat segregation have involved black students. Although the

Table 7. Percentage of white students in school attended by typical black student, by region, 1970 and 1980.

Area	1970	1980	Percentage point change, 1970-80
South	36.7	41.2	+ 4.5
Border	27.4	37.7	+10.3
Northeast	31.5	27.8	− 3.7
Midwest	23.6	30.6	+ 7.0
West	30.1	34.3	+ 4.2
U.S. average	32.0	36.2	+ 4.2

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 8. Percentage of black students in school attended by typical white student, by region, 1970 and 1980.

Area	1970	1980	Percentage point change, 1970-80
South	14.9	17.5	+2.6
Border	5.8	8.3	+2.5
Northeast	4.5	4.8	+0.3
Midwest	2.8	4.5	+1.7
West	2.4	3.4	+1.0
U.S. average	6.1	8.0	+1.9

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 9. Percentage of white students in schools 90 to 100 percent white, by region, 1968-80.

Area	1968	1972	1976	1980	Percentage point change,1968-80
South	70.6	38.0	34.6	35.0	−35.6
Border	80.0	75.9	64.8	64.1	−15.9
Northeast	83.0	82.9	81.4	80.2	− 2.8
Midwest	89.4	87.5	84.7	81.2	− 8.2
West	63.0	56.0	49.9	43.3	−19.7
U.S. average	78.4	68.9	64.9	61.2	−17.2

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 10 Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, 1968-80.

Year	Predominantly minority	90%-100% minority
1968	54.8	23.1
1970	55.8	23.0
1972	56.6	23.3
1974	57.9	23.9
1976	60.8	24.8
1978	63.1	25.9
1980	68.1	28.8

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 11. Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority and 90 to 100 percent minority schools, by region, 1968-80.

Area	1968	1972	1976	1980	Percentage point change, 1968-80
PERCENTAGE IN PREDOMINANTLY MINORITY SCHOOLS*					
South	69.6	69.9	70.9	76.0	+ 6.4
Border	†	†	†	†	†
Northeast	74.8	74.4	74.9	76.3	+ 1.5
Midwest	31.8	34.4	39.3	46.6	+14.8
West	42.4	44.7	52.7	63.5	+21.1
U.S. average	54.8	56.6	60.8	68.1	+13.3
PERCENTAGE IN 90%-100% PERCENT MINORITY SCHOOLS					
South	33.7	31.4	32.2	37.3	+ 3.6
Border	†	†	†	†	†
Northeast	44.0	44.1	45.8	45.8	+ 1.8
Midwest	6.8	9.5	14.1	19.6	+12.8
West	11.7	11.5	13.3	18.5	+ 6.8
U.S. average	23.1	23.3	24.8	28.8	+ 5.7

* "Predominantly" minority schools are those 50 percent or more minority.

† Border state figures are not reported because the very small number of Hispanics in this region makes comparison misleading. Among the Hispanics who do reside in this region, 2.8 percent were in 90 to 100 percent minority schools in 1980 and 23.2 percent attended predominantly minority schools.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Supreme Court ruled in the 1973 Denver case that Hispanics as well as blacks should be desegregated when a school board was ordered to implement a plan, little has been done to enforce this policy. Few cases have been brought to court.

The size of this problem is growing along with the size of the Hispanic school-age population. In 1970, Hispanic students made up about one-twentieth of all students in the country; by 1980, they made up a twelfth.

As their numbers have grown, so has their separation from whites.[4] The substantial increase of Hispanic segregation during the seventies and the gradual decline of black segregation meant that by 1980 the typical Hispanic student attended a school that was more segregated than that of the typical black student. In 1980, the typical Hispanic student attended a school in which 35.5 percent of the children were white (Table 12): for the typical black student, the school was 36.2 percent white. In the same year, 68 percent of Hispanic students were in schools that were predominantly minority, compared with 63 percent for black students. Only in the percentages for students attending 90 to 100 percent minority schools were black students more highly segregated than Hispanics: 33 percent for blacks and 29 percent for Hispanics.

Because many areas in most regions have few Hispanic residents, the figures for the percentage of Hispanic students in a school attended by the typical white student are low except in the West (Table 13). And in some states with small Hispanic enrollments, almost all Hispanic students attend predominantly white schools (Table 14). Figures for some regions are heavily influenced by particular areas. Southern Hispanics are largely in Texas and the Miami area. In the Midwest the Chicago area plays a dominant role.

Hispanics are highly concentrated in a few states. A substantial majority of all Hispanic pupils in the United States attend schools in California and Texas. Most others live in New York, New Mexico, Illinois, Florida, and Arizona (see Table 15). These same states have seen the fastest growth in Hispanic enrollment.

The states with the largest proportions of Hispanics in their total enrollment are also among the states with the greatest segregation (see Table 16). The state with the largest proportion of Hispanic students in schools that are 90 to 100 percent minority is New York (57 percent). Texas, which educates more than a fourth of Hispanic children in the United States, has the second-highest figure (40 percent). It is followed by New Jersey (35 percent) and Illinois (32 percent).

In 1980, the typical Hispanic student in New York State was in a school with only 21 percent white students; the figure for Texas was 28 percent; New Jersey, 30 percent; and Illinois, 36 percent. All of these figures were worse than they had been in 1970 (see Table 17). The only states to show any significant improvements were Wyoming, where an influx of whites drawn by the energy boom raised the white proportion and lowered the

Table 12. Percentage of white students in school attended by typical Hispanic student, by region, 1970 and 1980.

Area	1970	1980	Percentage point change, 1970-1980
South	33.4	29.5	− 3.9
Border*	80.2	66.4	−13.8*
Northeast	27.5	27.0	− 0.5
Midwest	63.6	51.9	−11.7
West	53.2	39.8	−13.4
U.S. average	43.8	35.5	− 8.3

* Very few Hispanics live in this region.
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 13. Percentage of Hispanic students in school attended by typical white student, by region, 1970 and 1980.

Area	1970	1980
South	2.8	4.1
Border	0.3	0.6
Northeast	1.4	2.3
Midwest	1.0	1.4
West	8.9	11.1
U.S. average	2.8	3.9

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 14. Percentage of Hispanic students in schools more than 50 percent white, by state, 1968 and 1980.

State	Hispanic enrollment, 1980	Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly white schools		Percentage point change, 1968-80
		1968	1980	
California	1,002,188	61.0	32.1	−28.9
Texas	864,300	27.6	21.8	− 5.8
New York	325,532	17.6	17.8	0.2
New Mexico	125,779	26.7	24.7	− 1.9
Illinois	117,790	52.8	34.7	−18.0
Florida	117,562	49.9	30.3	−19.7
Arizona	116,644	47.9	37.7	−10.3
NewJersey	98,041	44.0	23.5	−20.5
Colorado	84,281	63.3	67.1	3.7
Connecticut	30,431	48.7	36.3	−12.4
Washington	30,428	87.9	60.0	−27.8
Massachusetts	30,098	75.1	50.4	−24.6
Utah	12,012	88.1	96.9	8.8
Oregon	11,949	99.4	98.2	− 1.1
Kansas	11,237	92.5	86.0	− 6.5
Idaho	9,737	99.5	99.8	0.3
Nevada	7,786	99.4	94.1	− 5.3
Wyoming	5,322	78.2	94.9	16.6
Rhode Island	2,973	63.9	69.6	5.7

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 15. States with largest Hispanic enrollment, 1980.

State	Hispanic enrollment	Percentage of national total Hispanic enrollment	Increase in enrollment, 1970-80	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100% minority schools
California	1,002,188	31.5	295,260	22.2
Texas	864,300	27.2	298,586	39.8
New York	325,532	10.2	8,944	56.8
New Mexico	125,779	4.0	16,465	17.1
Illinois	117,790	3.7	39,705	32.3
Florida	117,562	3.7	51,749	25.2

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 16. States with largest Hispanic enrollment and highest levels of segregation of Hispanic students according to three measures, 1980.

Rank	Hispanic percentage of total enrollment	Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of white students in school of typical Hispanic student*
1.	New Mexico	New York	New York	New York
2.	Texas	Texas	Texas	Texas
3.	California	New Jersey	New Jersey	New Jersey
4.	Arizona	New Mexico	Illinois	New Mexico
5.	Colorado	Florida	Pennsylvania	Florida
6.	New York	California	Florida	California
7.	New Jersey	Illinois	Connecticut	Illinois
8.	Florida	Connecticut	California	Connecticut
9.	Illinois	Arizona	New Mexico	Pennsylvania
10.	Connecticut	Pennsylvania	Arizona	Arizona

* Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, New York has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical Hispanic.

Table 17. Percentage of white students in the school of a typical Hispanic student, by state, 1970 and 1980 (in states with at least 5 percent Hispanic students).

State	Percentage Hispanic enrollment	Percentage of white students in school of typical Hispanic		Percentage point change, 1970-80
		1970	1980	
California	25.3	54.4	35.9	−18.5
Illinois	6.1	50.0	36.4	−13.6
Florida	7.9	46.4	35.3	−11.1
Connecticut	5.8	47.8	37.9	− 9.9
New Jersey	8.0	38.2	29.6	− 8.6
Nevada	5.2	83.7	75.3	− 8.4
New Mexico	46.5	36.9	32.6	− 4.3
Texas	30.4	31.1	27.7	− 3.4
Arizona	24.2	45.5	43.5	− 2.0
New York	12.0	21.6	20.8	− 0.8
Colorado	15.3	56.8	59.0	+ 2.2
Wyoming	5.3	75.3	82.8	+ 7.5

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Hispanic proportion statewide, and Colorado, probably because of the Denver desegregation plan.

The West is by far the most important region for Hispanics, and what happens to Hispanic students will have a larger impact on the West than on any other region. The West has 44 percent of the nation's Hispanic students, although it has only 19 percent of all students in the nation. Thus, almost one-fifth of the students in the public schools of the West are Hispanic—a larger proportion than in any other region (see Table 18). Hispanic students in the West now attend schools in which most children are from minority groups—sometimes schools with few non-Hispanic students. Already 63.5 percent of Hispanic students in the West are in predominantly minority schools. If Texas is considered with the western region, as it should be for analysis of Hispanic segregation, the level of segregation in this region would be significantly higher.

Several explanations can be offered for the increasing segregation of Hispanics. First, as a group that has been a small minority in a particular area grows and as the ethnic composition of the entire local population changes, children tend to be in schools with a higher proportion of minorities even if there is a good desegregation plan. Second, Hispanics tend to be concentrated in a relatively small number of large metropolitan areas to an extraordinary degree—even more so than blacks. These areas, particularly their central cities, are experiencing rapid increases in proportions of minority children. The 1980 census showed that 84 percent of Hispanics lived in metropolitan areas and 41 percent lived in central cities of metropolitan areas with more than a million residents. It is likely, as well, that discrimination of the type that helped force blacks into ghettos early in the century plays a part in the high segregation of Hispanics, as do the problems of language and immigration status.

Whatever the reasons, the segregation of Hispanic students is a serious problem and seems likely to become even more severe. Hispanic enrollment is growing in states that already are highly segregated. Although nationwide public school enrollments declined during the seventies, California and Texas each had an increase of nearly 300,000 Hispanic students during that decade. Data for 1982 from Los Angeles suggest that the number of Hispanic students is still growing.

The changes mean that Hispanic children growing up in the eighties will face different school situations than those of previous decades. In California, Florida, and Illinois, for example, the typical Hispanic student in 1970 was in a school that was half white; by 1980, this student was in a school that was two-thirds minority. Hispanic students are more and more likely to find themselves in schools with large numbers of the poor, the non-English speaking, and other minorities.

Table 18. Racial composition of public school enrollment, by region, 1970 and 1980.

Year and region	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White
1970					
Northeast	0.1	0.4	4.4	11.9	83.3
Border	0.8	0.2	0.3	17.3	81.4
South	0.2	0.1	5.5	27.2	66.9
Midwest	0.3	0.2	1.4	10.4	87.6
West	1.1	1.6	13.0	6.3	77.9
U.S. average	0.4	0.5	5.1	15.0	79.1
1980					
Northeast	0.2	1.4	6.6	13.6	78.3
Border	1.5	0.8	0.7	17.5	79.5
South	0.3	0.7	8.8	26.9	63.3
Midwest	0.6	0.9	2.3	12.4	83.7
West	1.8	4.4	19.0	6.8	68.0
U.S. average	0.8	1.9	8.0	16.1	73.2

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Chapter 2

The Cities and School Segregation

Although it is useful and interesting to compare regions and states, many of the decisions that determine educational integration take place within individual school districts or metropolitan areas. What happens in one large city can affect more minority children than what happens in several small states.

Intense residential segregation often means that minority families are extraordinarily dependent on one or a handful of urban school districts within a state. Outside the South, both blacks and Hispanics are overwhelmingly urban residents, principally of central cities within large metropolitan areas. And as minority dependence on these districts has grown, white enrollments have declined.

Another reason for examining the big cities is that, since the late sixties, they have been at the center of most of the conflict over desegregation. Far-reaching progress against rural and small-town segregation had been achieved by that time, and many small cities were in the process of peaceful desegregation. Since then, the political history of busing and school desegregation has revolved around big cities: Charlotte, Detroit, Richmond, Dayton, Columbus, Los Angeles, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, and others. Cases in these cities have been the focus of Supreme Court decisions and civil rights efforts.

Sweeping generalizations about the feasibility and success of school desegregation have been drawn from a few of these experiences. The decline of white enrollment in certain big cities after court-ordered desegregation, for example, has often been cited as proof that busing cannot work as a remedy and, in fact, has the long-term consequence of increasing racial separation.

To gain a better perspective on the issues raised, it is very important to review overall changes in the demographics of central-city school systems. The data permit some simple comparisons among city school districts of approximately similar size that have followed radically different desegregation policies, or no such policies at all. The data also permit examination of the different experiences of central-city-only school districts and districts that include both the central city and the suburbs.

Some of the most general patterns of change in composition of big-city school districts are evident in Table 19. The districts listed in that table serve almost 25 percent of the nation's black and Hispanic children but only 2 percent of white children.

Between 1968, when the systematic collection of national data began, and 1980, there was a clear and steady increase in the predominance of the minority student population in the largest city school systems. This trend held regardless of the region of the country and regardless of whether there was a school desegregation plan within the city schools. Six of the ten largest districts were more than half minority by 1968, but none was as much as two-thirds minority. By 1980, all had more than two-thirds minority students, and most had at least three-fourths minority students. Interestingly, the change in racial composition was most rapid in several Sunbelt cities: Los Angeles, Houston, Dallas, and Miami.

A closer look at big-city school districts that serve only the central-city portion of a metropolitan area shows a striking nationwide pattern of nonwhite majorities. Of the fifty school districts listed in Table 20, two-thirds had nonwhite majorities by 1980, and half of the remainder were rapidly moving in that direction. In other words, only about a sixth of these cities had reasonably stable white majorities. These were generally younger cities that included areas which would be considered suburbs elsewhere or cities in states with few minority residents.

WHITE ENROLLMENT DECLINE IN THE LARGEST DISTRICTS

The percentage of whites in central-city school districts (see Appendix B) has been declining for decades. Although in recent years most attention has been focused on the decline of white enrollments following busing orders, statistics show that the proportions of whites in the largest districts in the United States—whether they have central-city or countywide school systems—have been declining for twelve years. Virtually all large districts, regardless of whether they are desegregated or include both the city and the suburbs, have declining percentages of white enrollment. Indeed, because of the more rapid natural growth of minorities, the total national percentage of whites enrolled in schools—private as well as public—is gradually declining.

Table 19. Decline in enrollment of white students in selected large-city school districts, 1968-80.

City	Decline in number of white students	Percentage decline in number of whites
New York City	213,675	45.7
Los Angeles	222,522	63.4
Chicago	136,213	62.1
Philadelphia	45,096	41.2
Detroit	90,331	77.8
Houston	82,288	62.8
Dallas	58,929	60.2
Baltimore	38,830	58.0
Memphis	31,831	54.6
San Diego*	37,209	37.9
Washington, D.C.	4,957	59.9
Milwaukee	55,350	58.2
New Orleans	24,608	71.0
Cleveland	43,946	66.3
Atlanta	36,420	85.7
Boston	40,819	63.3
Denver	37,188	58.7

* Only predominantly white school district on list.
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

There have been large declines in white enrollment percentages in central cities, both in systems with purely voluntary desegregation plans, such as Houston and San Diego, and in those with mandatory busing plans, such as Detroit and Memphis. A number of the districts that have become overwhelmingly minority were well on the way to this transition long before desegregation began. Desegregation plans may have varied the rate of change, but not the basic direction of change (see Table 20).

What does make a difference, according to these figures, is the scope of the district. In the five largest central-city-only school districts, white enrollment percentages dropped sharply during this period. In the largest metropolitan districts, declines in white enrollment were less than half as large, even though most metropolitan districts were under far-reaching orders to bus for desegregation. All of these districts except for Clark County (metropolitan Las Vegas, Nevada) were in the southern and border states (Table 21). What appears to be centrally important is not the student assignment plan but the degree to which the school district encompassed the housing market area and thus made flight impractical.[1] A number of the largest southern metropolitan areas were also still receiving a substantial net inmigration of whites, which aided stable desegregation.

INCREASES IN THE PERCENTAGE OF BLACK STUDENTS

The data on increases in black enrollment percentages in large districts are difficult to summarize and interpret (see Appendix B). In contrast to the popular view, not all of the biggest increases in black enrollment occurred in inner cities, and not all of the inner-city areas experienced rapid growth in the percentage of black enrollment. Some large central-city school districts have been experiencing declines in the *numbers* of black students in recent years; the *percentages* of black students have increased only because whites are leaving the city more rapidly than blacks. Some of the most rapid increases in black percentages were in suburbs rather than cities. In a number of cities, the large increases in minority enrollment have been for Hispanic rather than black children.

The largest changes were in the city of Atlanta and two of its suburban counties; Prince Georges County, Maryland (a Washington, D.C. suburb); Detroit; Gary; Birmingham; Milwaukee; Memphis; and Flint, Michigan. Black enrollment in each of these jurisdictions increased by more than 20 percent during the 1970s. Atlanta, Detroit, Memphis, and Gary were overwhelmingly black school districts and were continuing to change. Detroit and Memphis had busing orders; Gary did not. Atlanta and its suburbs experienced rapid changes in spite of a political bargain that strictly limited busing in the hope of achieving stability. The racial composition of

Table 20. Total enrollment and racial composition of the fifty largest central-city school districts, 1980.

District	Total enrollment	Percentage black	Percentage white	Percentage Hispanic	Percentage Asian
1. New York	931,193	39	26	31	4
2. Los Angeles	538,038	23	24	45	7
3. Chicago	445,269	60	19	19	2
4. Miami (Dade Co.)*	232,951	30	32	38	1
5. Philadelphia	224,152	63	29	7	1
6. Detroit	211,886	86	12	2	0
7. Houston	194,060	45	25	28	2
8. Baltimore	129,979	78	21	0	0
9. Dallas	129,305	49	30	19	1
10. Memphis	110,113	75	24	0	0
11. San Diego	109,793	15	56	18	11
12. Washington	104,907	93	4	2	1
13. Milwaukee	87,826	46	45	6	1
14. New Orleans	85,707	84	12	1	3
15. Cleveland	80,074	67	28	4	1
16. Albuquerque	78,051	3	53	39	1
17. Columbus	73,094	39	59	0	1
18. Atlanta	72,295	91	8	0	0
19. Boston	67,366	46	35	14	5
20. Fort Worth	66,170	37	44	18	1
21. Indianapolis	65,958	50	49	0	0
22. Denver	64,274	23	41	32	3
23. St. Louis	61,474	[illegible]	21	0	0
24. El Paso	61,285	[illegible]	28	67	1
25. San Antonio	60,695	15	11	74	0

26. Newark	59,658	70	9	20	0
27. San Francisco	59,385	27	17	16	40
28. Tucson	55,654	5	62	29	2
29. Austin	55,369	19	53	27	1
30. Cincinnati	53,632	57	42	0	0
31. Portland	52,868	14	76	2	7
32. Tulsa	49,454	23	69	1	1
33. Seattle	49,156	22	56	4	15
34. Oakland	48,863	66	14	10	9
35. Buffalo	48,236	47	47	4	0
36. Fresno	47,770	12	54	31	3
37. Birmingham	46,523	76	24	0	0
38. Pittsburgh	46,239	50	49	0	1
39. Toledo	45,488	33	62	4	1
40. Wichita	44,921	19	72	4	3
41. Omaha	44,719	25	70	2	1
42. Minneapolis	42,797	21	69	1	4
43. Oklahoma City	41,185	35	55	4	2
44. Sacramento	39,873	22	46	17	13
45. Akron	38,926	35	64	0	0
46. Kansas City	38,279	67	28	4	1
47. Norfolk	37,471	58	39	1	3
48. Corpus Christi	37,383	6	28	65	0
49. St. Paul	37,051	13	74	5	6
50. Fort Wayne	34,716	20	77	2	1

* For the purposes of this table, Dade County is considered the central city of the South Florida urban complex.
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 21. Percentage of white enrollment in the largest school districts in the southern and border states, 1968-80.

District	1968	1974	1980	Percentage point change, 1968-80
Dade Co., Fla. (Miami)*	58	44	32	−18
Houston, Texas	53	39	25	−28
Broward Co., Fla (Ft. Lauderdale)†	80	76	72	− 8
Dallas, Texas	61	45	30	−31
Baltimore City, Md.	35	27	21	−14
Fairfax Co., Va.	97	95	86	−11
Prince Georges Co., Md.	85	67	46	−39
Hillsborough Co., Fla. (Tampa)†	74	74	75	+ 1
Memphis, Tenn.	46	29	24	−22
Montgomery Co., Md.	94	89	78	−16
Jefferson Co., Ky.†	80	94	72	− 8
Duval Co., Fla. (Jacksonville)†	72	67	63	− 9
Baltimore Co., Md.	96	93	86	−10
Washington, D.C.	6	3	4	− 2
Pinellas Co., Fla. (Clearwater)†	83	83	83	− 1
New Orleans, La.	32	19	12	−20
Orange Co., Fla. (Orlando)†	93	78	72	−21
Charlotte, N.C.†	71	66	60	−11
Atlanta, Ga.	38	15	8	−30
West Palm Beach, Fla.†	70	66	63	− 7
Nashville, Tenn.†	76	71	65	−11
Anne Arundel Co., Md.	86	86	84	− 2
Fort Worth, Texas	67	55	44	−23

* Dade County has a countywide plan which leaves some black areas segregated and often "desegregates" by combining two minorities—blacks and Hispanics in minority schools.

† City-suburban desegregation orders.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Prince Georges County, which is adjacent to a Washington, D.C., ghetto area, began to change rapidly in the late sixties; a major busing order was issued for the county in 1972. In Memphis, where a busing plan was resisted bitterly and a parallel "segregation academy" system of fundamentalist white schools was created, the percentage of black enrollment increased by 21 points between 1968 and 1980. Milwaukee, which has a smaller school system than Memphis, implemented a nationally acclaimed desegregation plan that relied on voluntary transfers to magnet schools without substantial resistance. Yet the percentage of blacks in Milwaukee schools increased by 22 points, slightly more than the increase in Memphis.

The cities and large metropolitan districts where the proportion of blacks increased by less than 10 percentage points from 1968 to 1980 have very different compositions. The list includes some of the nation's largest urban school systems—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia. It includes Denver, the first northern school district ordered to implement busing by the Supreme Court. And it includes areas with the largest metropolitan busing plans in the United States—Tampa, Louisville, Las Vegas, Jacksonville, West Palm Beach, and St. Petersburg.

Some districts had either no growth or declines in their black enrollment percentages, including San Francisco, Newark, and the southwestern cities of San Antonio, Tucson, and Corpus Christi. San Francisco, which probably has the nation's most diverse student population, was one of the first cities outside the South to implement busing for desegregation, but the black proportion did not rise.

The statistics show that busing does not explain basic enrollment changes. The effects seem to be strongest in initial phases of busing in those central cities that have large minority enrollments and that are surrounded by white suburbs not included in the busing plan (Rossell and Hawley 1981, pp. 169-70; Coleman and Kelly 1976, pp. 252-53). The data also show that there are more basic influences on enrollment trends that operate strongly regardless of whether there is a school desegregation plan. Finally, the data show that in many communities with little or no increase in the number of blacks, Hispanic enrollment is increasing as white enrollment falls.

HISPANIC ENROLLMENT IN THE LARGEST DISTRICTS

Hispanic enrollment is rapidly growing in the nation's largest school districts. In five of the fifty largest central-city school districts, Hispanic students were the largest single racial group by 1980: San Antonio Independent (74 percent), Corpus Christi (65 percent), El Paso (67 percent), Dade County (Miami), and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, which has the nation's second largest school district, the 1982-83 enrollment was 49 percent Hispanic, and the percentage of Hispanics is rapidly increasing.

The increases in the enrollment of Hispanic children in the nation's largest school districts, one of the most important trends from 1968 to 1980, was one of the major reasons for the national increases in Hispanic segregation (see Table 22). In Los Angeles, the Hispanic enrollment increased from 20 percent in 1968 to 49 percent by 1982. A similar change occurred in Dade County (Miami). In Chicago, the proportion of Hispanic students more than doubled, reaching 20 percent as Hispanic children replaced whites. A similar change took place in Dallas, and even more growth, from 13 percent to 28 percent by 1980, occurred in Houston, which was the largest city in the South by 1980. Majority Hispanic districts experienced rapid increases in the Hispanic share of their total enrollment.

Some older industrial cities that have become secondary migration centers for Hispanics experienced sharp increases from what had been a very low percentage of Hispanic students. Boston, for example, had an increase from 3 percent in 1968 to 14 percent in 1980. Newark's Hispanic enrollment had increased to 20 percent by 1980, and Jersey City's, to 29 percent.

There are many more major school districts with virtually no Hispanic children than with no black children. At this point, the Hispanic population is still far more geographically concentrated than blacks or non-Hispanic whites. Most Hispanic school children are in California or Texas. The 1980 census showed that close to half of the nation's Hispanic population was in ten metropolitan areas, three of which are part of the Los Angeles urban complex.

The enrollment trends show the emergence of some overwhelmingly Hispanic school districts and the development in several of the nation's largest urban areas of major school districts with two large and different minority populations. In some of these districts, the whites are already the third-largest group of students and are rapidly losing ground. Urban educators in some cities must now deal with the problems of two major segregated and unequal minority communities. Black and Hispanic children, who may have little contact with whites, face the need to work out relationships with each other. (In a few cities, rapidly growing settlements of Asian immigrants are introducing still further complexities.) As settlement patterns continue to develop, the list of large school districts confronting these challenges is likely to grow.

THE FUTURE OF BIG-CITY EDUCATION

The issues of segregation and equality for minority students have been on the agenda of big-city educators for a generation, but the statistics in this report show that little progress has been achieved outside the South and that most segregation remains in the large cities. In fact, the large city school

Table 22. Percentage of Hispanic enrollment in selected large districts,1968, 1980, and 1982.

District	1968	1980	1982	Percentage point change 1968-80	1968-82
New York	23	31	NA	8	NA
Los Angeles	20	45	49	25	29
Chicago	9	19	20	10	11
Miami (Dade County)	17	38	NA	21	NA
San Antonio	58	74	NA	16	NA
Houston	13	28	NA	15	NA

NA: Not Available
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

systems are now predominantly minority. The trends in the schools generally foretell trends in the cities as a whole and in the labor force and electorate. The trends show that tomorrow's cities will be characterized by unprecedented racial diversity and separation and that race relations will continue to be a central issue.

There are signs, as well, that the changes that emerged in the big cities after World War II are now beginning to have large effects on some suburban districts. Not only will many central-city school officials be forced to deal with another large minority group, but some suburban school districts that have always been all white also will confront sweeping changes.

The data on the largest districts point again to the importance of closely examining desegregation plans covering entire metropolitan areas, which diverge from the prevailing big-city approaches to desegregation in fundamental respects. Metropolitan school systems have the highest levels of integration and the greatest stability. Given the present composition of the large central-city districts and their well-established patterns of change, metropolitan approaches offer the only alternative for a growing list of cities such as Atlanta and Newark, where integration inside the city is impossible and where middle-class minority families are rapidly following whites out of the city. Segregation by race in these areas is supplemented by segregation by class and intensified by the political boundaries that separate the segments of the population. Recent sharp cuts in federal and state aid to big-city school districts have weakened the major mechanism that had been developed to deal with some of the consequences of racial and socioeconomic transformations of central-city education.

DESEGREGATION LEVELS IN THE LARGEST SYSTEMS

During the seventies, dramatic changes took place in the racial composition of schools in many central cities as a result of major demographic changes and a variety of desegregation plans. Among the largest urban districts there have been widely varying changes in the average percentages of whites in the schools attended by the typical black student, ranging from an increase in white students of 57 percentage points to a decline of 19 percentage points (Table 23). The changes depend on the residential patterns of the metropolitan area and the nature of the school desegregation plan adopted. In general, the greatest increases in integration of black students were in the big-city districts that include much of what would elsewhere be called surburbia within their boundaries and that have sweeping busing orders. The declines in desegregation have been in central-city districts where there is either no desegregation plan or where an earlier plan was eroded by demographic changes.

Table 23. Change in the percentage of white students in the school of the typical black student, by city, 1968-80.

District	Percentage point change
INCREASES	
St. Petersburg, Fla.	+57
Greenville, S.C.	+54
Winston-Salem, N.C.	+48
Oklahoma City, Okla.	+40
Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.	+38
Jacksonville, Fla.	+36
Omaha, Neb.	+35
Wichita, Kans.	+34
Charlotte, N.C.	+33
Nashville, Tenn.	+31
West Palm Beach, Fla.	+28
Columbus, Ohio	+28
Dayton, Ohio	+28
Mobile, Ala.	+21
Denver, Colo.	+21
Cleveland, Ohio	+20
Tulsa, Okla.	+20
Milwaukee, Wis.	+19
Little Rock, Ark.	+19
Charleston, S.C.	+18
Fresno, Calif.	+18

Continued on next page.

Table 23. *Continued.*

DECREASES	
Sacramento, Calif.	−19
Anaheim, Calif.	−18
Paterson, N.J.	−17
Jersey City, N.J.	−16
New Haven, Conn.	−14
Gary, Ind.	−13
Hartford, Conn.	−12
Providence, R.I.	−12
San Francisco, Calif.	−11
Riverside, Calif.	−11
New York City, N.Y.	−10
Bridgeport, Conn.	− 9
El Paso, Tex.	− 9
Oakland, Calif.	− 6
Flint, Mich.	− 6
Newark, N.J.	− 5
Detroit, Mich.	− 4
Long Beach, Calif.	− 4
St. Paul, Minn.	− 4
Springfield, Mass.	− 4

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

A closer look at the demography of the largest districts of the southern and border states, almost all of which have desegregation orders or plans, shows the differential impact of the demographic changes on different sorts of school districts (see Table 23). The desegregation plans limited to central cities faced the same patterns of demographic change that affected cities across the nation. White enrollment, and thus the possibility of continuing integration, was far more stable in the countywide districts with city-suburban busing than it was in the central-city-only districts with no significant mandatory desegregation (including Houston, New Orleans, and Baltimore). The next section shows that integration levels are also much higher in these more stable metropolitan areas with countywide school systems.

Children in Washington, D.C., attend the most solidly black big-city schools in the United States. The school system was only 3.4 percent white in 1980, and thus significant desegregation within the system is impossible. Eighty-three percent of the District's minority children were in schools where the white enrollment was 1 percent or less. Only 1 D.C. minority student in 200 was in a school that was as much as half white. The only large cities that came close to this level of segregation were Newark, Atlanta, and Chicago. The nation's capital had a predominantly black enrollment even when its schools were still segregated by law, and it is subject to the problems of separate city and suburban school districts more absolutely than other cities, because of its unique status outside any state.

The Hispanic enrollment (and the much smaller Asian enrollment) is growing much faster than the black or white enrollments nationally and in many school districts. Many big-city systems have had declining white enrollments for years and recent drops in black enrollments as well. Migration, differential birth rates and age structures of the population, and continued white suburbanization all point toward a continuation of the pattern. In a number of large districts where blacks remain the dominant group, Hispanics are likely to overtake whites as the second largest group. In Chicago, for example, Latinos now make up 20.4 percent of the enrollment, and as of fall 1982, only 16.3 percent of the students were white.

Chapter 3

Metropolitan Desegregation Patterns

The basic unit of analysis for urban trends in the United States is the metropolitan area, or, in Census Bureau terms, the standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA). When one speaks of the Chicago economy, the Los Angeles housing market, the Atlanta power structure, the Houston transportation problem, or the pollution problem of any major city in the United States, the entire metropolitan area is being considered, not merely the central city. Most Americans live within metropolitan complexes, but most of the urban dwellers live outside the central cities. In a few areas, this is true for minority residents as well.

We routinely receive data on metropolitan housing and job statistics and many other kinds of information simply because the metropolitan area is the basic unit of analysis for understanding many issues in American society. The federal government, however, has never released data comparing metropolitan areas on school desegregation problems and progress. We know that most remaining segregation is concentrated within big districts inside metropolitan areas. This makes it very important to compare the results in areas which have taken quite different approaches to desegregation.

The future of integration for currently segregated minority families will be determined largely by decisions about the future of schools and housing in large metropolitan areas. In Illinois, for example, about two-thirds of all the black and Hispanic students in the state attend the city of Chicago's public schools, which are among the nation's most segregated. Only about one-sixteenth of the whites in the state, however, attend Chicago schools. What happens within this one school system in the Chicago metropolitan area will affect more minority families than anything else that can be done in

the state. Many of the state's remaining minority children live in a few communities in Chicago's suburban ring. There are very few entire states that have as many black and Hispanic students as this one metropolitan area.

Although the federal government has periodically released data for central cities, it has not produced comparative statistics for metropolitan areas. In fact, its data collection system, which is set up to look at individual districts only for civil rights enforcement purposes, requires submission of data by central cities but often omits many individual suburbs, particularly those with few minority students. There is some reason, in terms of civil rights enforcement, to concentrate on obtaining data from districts with large minority enrollments since desegregation plans are normally limited to a single school district. The resulting data, however, give a very misleading picture of those metropolitan areas where a great many white students attend school in virtually all-white districts. It is impossible to assess accurately the level of segregation and the progress or movement backward in such districts. The data collected are particularly inadequate for metropolitan areas with highly fragmented educational systems that include many small suburban districts. This pattern characterizes the older urban centers in the East and Midwest—areas that are often the centers of segregation in what are now the nation's most segregated states.

These problems with the federal data system mean that we lack basic knowledge about segregation trends in some of our most important urban communities. Because the federal statistics are the only statistics collected nationally and serve as the basis for research and policy debate as well as civil rights activities, this is a serious problem. Using the current statistics, it is not possible to say anything about segregation trends in such vast urban areas as metropolitan New York or Chicago.

This report uses the federal data to assess and compare metropolitan desegregation trends in those areas where the information collected by the Department of Education is at least minimally adequate, which tend to be the less fragmented metropolitan communities of the South and West. Because so few large northern metropolitan areas can be analyzed, this section provides only a comparative analysis of metropolitan desegregation trends in the South and West.

It is important to note one source of possible confusion in the following discussion. A number of the same metropolitan areas were discussed in the analysis of big cities. In that section, however, the data were limited to single districts. Although some of these large districts were countywide and happen to include most students in the metropolitan area, many included only the central city or part of the suburban ring, and none was larger than a single county. This section, in contrast, combines data from all the individual school districts surveyed within an SMSA as defined by the Bureau of the Census. Typically, each SMSA includes a central city and

the adjacent counties that have experienced significant suburbanization. (Los Angeles and Miami are major exceptions. The Census Bureau limits these SMSAs to a single county and puts the outlying suburban rings into other SMSAs.) Many SMSAs include several counties and large numbers of independent school districts. Thus, even though the name of the central city is used in the text and tables of this section to identify the metropolitan area, the statistics refer to different units of analysis than those in the preceding section.

The only metropolitan areas that can be studied are those for which the U.S Department of Education has racial data for the large majority of the students. To find out which areas these are, we compared the 1980-81 Department of Education data with the total metropolitan public school enrollments through a special tabulation by the National Center for Educational Statistics. This tabulation had total enrollments, but not racial data, for all districts from the previous school year. This report includes data only for those SMSAs in which the Department of Education data are estimated to cover at least 70 percent of the total enrollment. Because the sample has always counted a considerably higher proportion of minority than white children, these statistics offer very strong coverage of minority children's experiences in desegregation. A substantially higher fraction of minority than white children have been counted because of the federal policies requiring submission of data from districts with substantial minority enrollments for civil rights enforcement purposes.

In order to avoid problems that could arise from reporting those measures of segregation which are highly sensitive to the percentage of white students counted, only one measure of segregation is used in this portion of the report. That measure, the exposure index, shows the percentages of white students in the schools attended by the typical black or Hispanic student in the metropolitan area. Because the sample includes the great majority of blacks and Hispanics and the schools they attend, this measure is the most reliable analysis of the existing federal data. It does not require data from all-white schools for accuracy, as do some other measures. And because desegregation policy is designed to rectify the segregation of minority youngsters, this is a useful and powerful measure with which to begin a comparative analysis. Other measures would be invaluable but cannot be accurately prepared with existing data.

Along with other data collection problems, the federal survey sampled different districts in different years within the suburbs. But since all the samples had the common feature of greatly oversampling districts with significant minority enrollments, this is not a fatal problem for this analysis. The statistics presented here should be accepted, however, as the best possible approximations rather than exact findings (Killalea Associates 1980).

GENERAL FINDINGS

Metropolitan areas contain very large numbers of students, and a short list of the metropolitan areas with the largest total enrollments would include a significant fraction of all students in the United States. In the 1980-81 school year, for example, more than a sixth of the nation's students went to schools in metropolitan New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. All of these metropolitan areas had small white minorities and large numbers of segregated nonwhite children in their central-city school districts. None had a desegregation plan crossing city-suburban boundary lines; several had no significant desegregation at all. None of the ten largest metropolitan areas had substantially desegregated public schools. Forty-two entire states have smaller enrollments than metropolitan New York, or metropolitan Los Angeles, or metropolitan Chicago. Obviously, progress toward desegregation or regression toward segregation in these large metropolitan regions and their smaller counterparts in other states deserves careful analysis.

Extraordinary differences are found among metropolitan areas, even among those of relatively similar size and racial composition in the same region, and sometimes even in the same state. In some, there have been virtually no segregated schools for more than a decade; in others, there are very few integrated schools and hundreds of black, white, or Hispanic schools. Some entire urban communities have had little experience with segregation and now have an entire generation of students who have known integration as the norm. In others, racial isolation operates on a large scale and is more intense than it was a generation ago.

These differences have major consequences. According to research by Diana Pearce at Catholic University, metropolitan areas in which schools have been desegregated are now experiencing considerably more housing integration than those which retained segregated schools (Pearce 1980). According to research by Robert Crain of Johns Hopkins University and Rita Mahard of the University of Michigan, city-suburban plans produce dramatically greater educational gains for black students than central-city-only plans (Crain and Mahard 1978, 1981a, 1981b). If the wide differences among urban areas continue and further research confirms the broad impacts of these different approaches, the future may be one of widely divergent metropolitan societies with very different kinds of race relations.

METROPOLITAN AREAS IN THE SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES

The southern and border-state area is most interesting for analysis of metropolitan trends, for several reasons. First, the data are most complete,

and it is possible to look at trends in most large metropolitan areas. Second, it is the only region that has had a considerable number of metropolitan areas with regionwide desegregation for a number of years. Third, in the South, many suburbs as well as central cities have significant minority populations and some kind of desegregation plan. Fourth, almost all the metropolitan areas, unlike many in the North, have a substantial minority population. Fifth, the southern states include a number of the most important Sunbelt cities, whose development will do much to influence race relations in the United States for decades to come. Unlike older and declining metropolitan areas, these rapidly growing communities still have many fundamental choices to make about the educational and residential patterns of their metropolitan regions.

Among the large southern and border-state metropolitan areas for which we have adequate data, the racial composition of the schools attended by the typical black student ranges from a low of less than one-fifth white enrollment in the Miami and New Orleans SMSAs to more than two-thirds white enrollment in the Tampa, Louisville, and Wilmington SMSAs (Table 24). In the relatively small number of large SMSAs with at least 5 percent Hispanic population, the range is more narrow. Hispanic students have the most contact with whites in the Austin and West Palm Beach districts and the least in the predominantly Hispanic Texas SMSAs of McAllen, El Paso, and San Antonio.

As shown in Table 25, the largest increases in integration for black students occurred in Louisville, Tampa, Wilmington, and Oklahoma City. The largest increase in segregation was in Miami. Among Hispanic students, the only substantial increase in metropolitan integration in an area with more than 5 percent Hispanics was in Austin, and the largest declines in the percentages of whites were in metropolitan Miami and Houston.

The relationship between desegregation policy and actual level of desegregation accomplished is obvious in these tables. All of the areas with the highest levels of integration for blacks have extensive city-suburban busing orders, and two of the leaders in increasing integration during the seventies (Louisville and Wilmington) had court orders forcing merger and desegregation of previously independent city and suburban school systems. The major reduction in segregation for Hispanics came in Austin, which recently implemented a major desegregation order—one of the few major busing orders with an explicit goal of desegregating Hispanics.

Differences are clearly apparent if one compares these cities with Richmond and Atlanta, where federal courts have rejected city-suburban desegregation. In metropolitan Richmond, desegregation plans exist within separate parts of the metropolitan area, but the typical black student is in a school that is almost three-fourths black, and the level of integration dropped from 1970 to 1980. In Atlanta, where the Supreme Court recently rejected a city-suburban plan, black students are even more segregated than in Richmond, and segregation also increased slightly during the seventies.

Table 24. Integration levels for black and Hispanic students in largest surveyed metropolitan areas in southern and border states, 1980.

Metropolitan area	Percentage of whites in school attended by typical black student	Percentage of whites in school attended by typical Hispanic student
Washington, D.C.	24.7	†
Houston, Tex.	20.1	37.2
Atlanta, Ga.	22.3	†
Baltimore, Md.	24.3	†
Miami, Fla.	17.9	24.4
Tampa, Fla.	72.4	†
San Antonio, Tex.	27.0	20.8
New Orleans, La.	19.6	†
Memphis, Tenn.	20.8	†
Norfolk, Va.	44.9	†
Birmingham, Ala.	24.1	†
Jacksonville, Fla.	49.7	†
Greensboro, N.C.	60.1	†
Orlando, Fla.	53.6	†
Louisville, Ky.	67.9	†
Nashville, Tenn.	55.9	†
Oklahoma City, Okla.	55.5	†
El Paso, Tex.	*	17.3
Richmond, Va.	28.3	†
Greenville, S.C.	65.3	†
Baton Rouge, La.	29.2	†
Mobile, Ala.	34.9	†
Charleston, S.C.	34.1	†
Wilmington, Del.	67.8	†
Shreveport, La.	30.5	†
West Palm Beach, Fla.	44.3	55.2
Austin, Tex.	45.0	46.1
Little Rock, Ark.	49.9	†
Columbia, S.C.	34.6	†
Augusta, Ga.	46.3	†
McAllen, Tex.	*	7.1

* Less than 5 percent black enrollment
† Less than 5 percent Hispanic enrollment
Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 25. Changes in integration levels for black and Hispanic students in the largest surveyed metropolitan areas in the southern and border states, 1970-80.

Metropolitan area	Change in percentage of whites in school attended by typical black student	Change in percentage of whites in school attended typical Hispanic student
Washington, D.C.	− 7.6	−20.4†
Houston, Tex.	+ 0.9	− 8.4
Atlanta, Ga.	− 0.8	−20.3†
Baltimore, Md.	+ 5.4	− 8.6†
Miami, Fla.	− 8.1	−14.1
Tampa, Fla.	+36.8	− 2.8†
San Antonio, Tex.	+ 4.7	− 0.9
New Orleans, La.	+ 2.4	− 5.3†
Memphis, Tenn.	+ 7.1	−15.7†
Norfolk, Va.	+11.1	−10.5†
Birmingham, Ala.	+ 2.6	−13.5†
Jacksonville, Fla.	+19.4	−14.8†
Greensboro, N.C.	+18.6	−13.1†
Orlando, Fla.	+ 9.3	− 9.0†
Louisville, Ky.	+43.0	−13.2†
Nashville, Tenn.	+18.8	−14.6†
Oklahoma, Okla.	+33.1	−23.4†
El Paso, Tex.	− 6.4*	− 3.2
Richmond, Va.	− 1.2	− 8.2†
Greenville, S.C.	− 5.1	− 4.9†
Baton Rouge, La.	+ 2.6	0.0†
Mobile, Ala.	+ 5.9	+ 1.0†
Charleston, S.C.	+ 4.6	− 7.4†
Wilmington, Del.	+35.5	+18.4†
Shreveport, La.	+ 4.6	− 6.3†
West Palm Beach, Fla.	+11.6	− 7.1
Austin, Tex.	+25.4	+12.4
Little Rock, Ark.	+14.0	− 9.8†
Columbia, S.C.	− 4.9	−23.2†
Augusta, Ga.	+ 9.7	−23.3†
McAllen, Tex.	− 2.5*	− 6.7

* Less than one-twentieth of metropolitan enrollment is black.

† Less than one-twentieth of metropolitan enrollment is Hispanic.

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

The comparison between these two cities and major southern and border districts that have metropolitan plans is striking. Metropolitan school desegregation orders have had a pronounced and lasting impact on segregation.

Desegregation orders limited to central cities have been highly successful, measured by the exposure rate, only in cases where a central city contains much of the metropolitan population and a relatively high percentage of white students. For example, in Austin and Oklahoma City, the two cities where orders limited to the central city had most impact, as of 1980 more than half of the students were white, in contrast to many largely minority big-city districts in the region.

One important development in the South, which is evident in these data but has not received serious attention previously, is the emergence of some metropolitan areas where a majority of all of the public school students are from "minority" groups. Memphis and New Orleans, for example, have black majorities even on a metropolitan basis. Most of the metropolitan areas of South Texas have Hispanic majorities in public schools. Some major metropolitan areas outside the South either have or are moving toward nonwhite majorities. In a few metropolitan areas, particularly those near the Mexican border in Texas, even the most far-reaching metropolitan plan would leave many minority students in predominantly Hispanic schools.

There is a need for serious thought about what the goals of desegregation should be in such a setting, and how its progress should be measured. These questions will become increasingly important as public school enrollment in some of the major metropolitan areas in California and elsewhere becomes predominantly minority. For the time being, it is important to note that the statistics on segregation in some metropolitan regions reflect not merely a failure to develop desegregation policies but also some extraordinary demographic obstacles to full integration.

Overall, the metropolitan trends in the South are strongly related to different kinds of desegregation plans. City-suburban plans and plans in predominantly white big-city districts have produced high levels of desegregation, which have remained high even years after the court order. In large SMSAs with predominantly minority central-city school districts, there has been much less progress in integration for minority children, whether or not there has been a desegregation plan. There has been little progress in desegregating Hispanic students on a metropolitan basis anywhere in the region, with the single exception of Austin.

METROPOLITAN AREAS IN THE WESTERN STATES

The West, the only other region where the data permit some comparative analyses of the large SMSAs, is different from the southern and border areas in key respects. Its dominant minority is Hispanic, not black.

Western Hispanics are rapidly becoming more segregated, in contrast to the large increases in desegregation for southern blacks. California dominates the region's statistics in a way not true for any southern state. Thus California's metropolitan areas are of decisive importance for the region's black and Hispanic populations, which are both very highly urbanized.

Among the large metropolitan areas surveyed, only the Denver SMSA had a decline in segregation of both black and Hispanic students during the 1970s. Denver, which was ordered to desegregate as the result of the Supreme Court's first busing decision outside the South in 1973, has a plan designed to desegregate both groups.

The largest increases in the percentages of whites in the schools of the typical black student during the 1970s were in Las Vegas (up 14.5 percent) and Denver (up 10.2 percent). The Las Vegas (Clark County) desegregation plan is the only large metropolitan plan in the West. Most of the western metropolitan areas did, however, modestly reduce segregation of black students during the decade (Table 26). Of course, black enrollment percentages were much smaller in many western metropolitan areas than in their counterparts in the South and the older industrial states.

Segregation of Hispanics increased in all of the SMSAs listed in Table 27, except in Denver and Tucson, where there were slight gains in integration. Denver and Tucson both had school desegregation orders.

The most dramatic declines in the percentages of whites in the schools of the typical Hispanic student occurred in the urban corridor of Southern California (San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles counties), where there was massive Chicano migration. The typical metropolitan Los Angeles student had been in a 45 percent white school in 1970 but was in a 78 percent minority school by 1980. In Orange and San Diego counties, where the Hispanic percentages were much lower, the typical Hispanic student was in a school that was more than 66 percent white in 1970 but in a predominantly minority school by 1980. (The Census Bureau defines the Orange County suburbs of Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Garden Grove as a separate SMSA.) Los Angeles had a limited school desegregation plan, but the mandatory portions were dismantled in 1981. San Diego had a small voluntary plan limited to the central city. There were no court orders in Orange County.

Most of the major urban centers of California and the Pacific Northwest are experiencing not only substantial growth of Hispanic population but also large increases in the number of Asian children. Indeed, the San Francisco school district has far more Asian than black, white, or Hispanic students. When these migration trends are combined with the region's low white birth rate and the residential segregation of blacks and Hispanics, it is not difficult to understand the growing likelihood that, in the absence of strong and effective desegregation policies, minority children will find themselves in schools with few whites.

Table 26. Segregation of black students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 5 percent black, 1970 and 1980.

Metropolitan area	Percentage of white students in school of typical black		Percentage point change, 1970-80
	1970	1980	
Los Angeles	13.7	16.1	2.4
San Francisco-Oakland	27.0	23.3	− 3.7
Fresno	29.9	35.8	5.9
Phoenix	29.1	36.3	7.2
San Diego	35.7	42.5	6.8
Sacramento	60.7	50.0	−10.7
Denver	40.0	50.2	10.1
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa	64.7	50.7	−14.0
Seattle	52.3	56.5	4.2
Riverside	59.2	57.0	− 2.2
Colorado Springs	63.1	67.9	4.8
Las Vegas	53.5	68.0	14.5
Tacoma	77.1	71.6	− 5.5

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

Table 27. Segregation of Hispanic students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 10 percent Hispanic, 1970 and 1980.

Metropolitan area	Percentage of whites in school of typical Hispanic student		Percentage point change, 1970-80
	1970	1980	
Los Angeles	44.9	21.8	−23.1
Albuquerque	39.2	36.3	− 2.9
Tucson	38.2	38.3	0.1
Fresno	49.0	39.3	− 9.7
San Francisco-Oakland	61.5	44.6	−16.9
San Diego	67.4	45.2	−22.2
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove	72.8	48.7	−24.1
Phoenix	508	50.1	− 0.7
Riverside	63.1	54.5	− 8.6
Denver	55.6	55.8	0.2
Sacramento	70.0	56.5	−13.5
Modesto	78.5	62.0	−16.5
Vellejo-Fairfield-Napa	78.5	66.8	−11.7
Las Vegas	81.9	70.6	−11.3
Colorado Springs	72.0	71.7	− 0.3

Source: U.S. Department of Education data.

In fact, not only are minority children (except Asians) highly segregated from whites, but there is also a substantial tendency for each of the minorities in these cosmopolitan cities to be segregated from each other. The San Francisco desegregation plan aims at creating multi-ethnic schools, and civil rights lawyers in Los Angeles urged a plan that would have a similar goal. Obviously, these will be new dilemmas in metropolitan areas where a substantial majority of the school children will be from an assortment of minority groups.

In a number of the western metropolitan areas where segregation was addressed through a plan limited to the central city, the segregation trends produced by continuing white suburbanization, neighborhood resegregation, and continuing inmigration of minority families are gradually diminishing the level of integration for minority children. This is apparent now, for example, in Sacramento. In the long run, these forces will necessitate city-surburban desegregation in the West if substantial integration is to be maintained.

In most instances, the western metropolitan regions studied here have shown significant progress in reducing the segregation of blacks, the region's second-largest minority. However, Hispanics, the largest group of minority students, have become substantially more segregated. In the West, unlike the South, desegregation orders are far from universal even within central cities. City-suburban desegregation on a large scale exists only in Las Vegas, where levels of integration are comparable to the highest in the South. The region's demographic trends foretell increasing segregation of minority children and increasing difficulties in holding on to the desegregation achievements of the past generation in those SMSAs with city-only plans and large minority enrollments. Perhaps the leaders of urban education in the West should examine the experiences of metropolitan areas in the South.

Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

This report shows that major progress was achieved in southern desegregation of black students from 1968 to 1980 and suggests that the difference between that record and the much slower change in the North was due in part to the much stronger enforcement of civil rights policies in the southern and border states. It also shows clear evidence of increasing segregation of Hispanic children in all parts of the United States. The analysis presented here indicates that the key problems of segregation facing the nation are in the cities, and that the central reason for success where segregation has been reduced dramatically has been implementation of city-suburban desegregation plans, or citywide plans in the small number of big-city school districts that still retain white majorities and serve a large fraction of the metropolitan population.

The findings of this project support the following recommendations:

1. Racial data on all school districts in metropolitan areas should be regularly collected and released. Even with the cooperation of the Department of Education, it has been impossible to do any serious analysis of segregation trends in the largest urban areas of the East and Midwest where segregation is most intense. It is impossible to develop good research and policy analysis without such basic data.

2. The implications of increasing segregation of Hispanic students and the impact on Hispanics of various forms of desegregation should be seriously investigated. Little governmental or scholarly attention has been

devoted to the rapid increase in the segregation of this large and expanding minority group. If the consequences turn out to be anything like those produced by segregation of black education, this neglect may be similar to the failure of northern educators to address questions of ghetto education throughout its formative period in the early twentieth century.[1] Certainly we should begin as soon as possible to evaluate the consequences and the possible remedies.

3. City-suburban desegregation plans should be encouraged and supported. Since the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act there has been no positive action by Congress to encourage or require desegregation, except for the financial aid granted by the Emergency School Aid Act, which was repealed in 1981. Congress should reinstate that important program, which funded educational and training components of desegregation plans but not busing. It should offer special assistance for voluntary or court-ordered city-suburban desegregation.[2]

4. Housing desegregation policy should be strenthened. One of the clear implications of statistics showing increases in segregation in areas without strong busing policies is that policies intended to diminish residential segregation are not working. Strengthening the very weak federal fair housing law, developing policies in support of integrated neighborhoods, and requiring administration of housing programs in a way that contributes to rather than undermines school integration could provide real support for school desegregation while taking some of the burdens of change off the courts and local educators.[3]

Appendix A

School Segregation, by State, 1980

State	Percentage of black students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of whites in school of typical black	Percentage of whites in school of typical Hispanic
Alabama	31.9	1.3	39.7	77.3
Alaska	.1	.6	73.6	75.8
Arizona	14.0	12.8	44.2	43.5
Arkansas	5.1	0	46.5	80.4
California	41.4	22.2	27.7	35.9
Colorado	.5	1.6	54.2	59.0
Connecticut	32.0	24.9	40.3	37.9
Delaware	.8	0	68.5	63.4
District of Columbia	95.9	23.1	1.5	17.9
Florida	17.4	25.2	50.6	35.3
Georgia	25.8	2.3	38.3	68.9
Hawaii	5.6	11.9	44.5	26.9
Idaho	0	0	86.4	85.4
Illinois	67.7	32.3	19.0	36.4
Indiana	34.7	24.6	38.7	52.1
Iowa	0	0	78.7	88.7
Kansas	9.9	2.9	59.1	72.5
Kentucky	0	0	74.3	87.1
Louisiana	36.9	4.9	32.8	60.8
Maine	0	0	97.3	97.5
Maryland	30.3	.8	35.4	67.4
Massachusetts	1.7	4.5	50.4	52.6
Michigan	51.0	3.0	22.5	70.6
Minnesota	0	.2	69.9	84.1
Mississippi	36.7	6.8	29.2	56.7

Continued on next page.

State	Percentage of black students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100% minority schools	Percentage of whites in school of typical black	Percentage of whites in school of typical Hispanic
Missouri	44.2	.5	34.1	72.7
Montana	.2	0	90.2	85.5
Nebraska	1.9	.1	65.5	84.0
Nevada	5.8	.4	68.4	75.3
New Hampshire	0	0	95.5	95.9
New Jersey	50.0	34.9	26.4	29.6
New Mexico	4.7	17.1	49.6	32.6
New York	56.2	56.8	23.0	20.8
North Carolina	4.8	.8	54.0	66.2
North Dakota	0	0	89.6	93.7
Ohio	14.7	.9	43.2	68.8
Oklahoma	7.7	1.6	57.6	71.8
Oregon	0	0	66.6	83.9
Pennsylvania	49.0	28.8	29.3	43.4
Rhode Island	0	0	65.8	61.5
South Carolina	14.3	1.0	42.7	67.9
South Dakota	0	0	89.9	88.8
Tennessee	29.8	.5	38.0	82.4
Texas	33.9	39.8	35.2	27.7
Utah	0	0	77.9	82.8
Vermont	0	0	98.5	98.5
Virginia	4.9	0	47.4	75.1
Washington	1.4	.1	66.9	63.5
West Virginia	0	0	78.7	91.8
Wisconsin	21.2	2.2	44.5	65.2
Wyoming	0	0	77.8	82.8

Appendix B

Percentage of White and Black Enrollment, Largest School Districts, 1968-80

District	White				Black			
	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80
New York City	44	31	26	−18	31	38	38	7
Los Angeles	54	42	24	−30	22	25	23	1
Chicago	38	28	19	−19	53	58	60	7
Dade County, Fla. (Miami)	58	44	32	−26	24	26	30	6
Philadelphia	39	33	29	−10	59	62	63	4
Detroit	39	26	12	−27	59	72	86	27
Houston	53	39	25	−28	33	42	45	12
Broward Co., Fla. (Ft. Lauderdale)	80	76	72	− 8	20	22	24	4
Dallas	61	45	30	−31	31	43	49	18
Baltimore City	35	27	21	−14	65	72	77	12
Fairfax Co., Va.	97	95	86	−11	3	4	7	4
Prince Georges Co., Md.	85	67	46	−39	15	31	50	35
Hillsborough Co., Fla. (Tampa)	74	74	75	1	19	19	20	1
Memphis	46	29	24	−22	54	71	75	21
San Diego	76	72	56	−20	12	14	15	3
Montgomery Co., Md.	94	89	78	−16	4	8	12	8
Jefferson Co., Ky.	80	94	72	− 8	20	5	27	7
Duval Co., Fla. (Jacksonville)	72	67	63	− 9	28	33	36	8
Baltimore Co., Md.	96	93	86	−10	4	6	12	8
Washington, D.C.	6	3	4	− 2	93	96	94	1

(*continued*)

District	White				Black			
	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80
Milwaukee	73	62	45	−28	24	33	46	22
Clark Co., Nev. (Las Vegas)	—	81	77	− 4	—	14	15	1
Pinellas Co., Fla. (Clearwater)	83	83	82	− 1	16	16	17	1
New Orleans	32	19	12	−20	67	79	84	17
Orange Co., Fla. (Orlando)	93	78	72	−21	7	19	23	16
Cleveland	43	39	28	−15	56	57	67	11
De Kalb Co., Ga. (Decatur)	94	84	66	−28	6	15	32	26
Jefferson Co., Colo.	98	94	93	− 5	0	0.2	0.6	0.4
Albuquerque	60	56	53	− 7	2	3	3	1
Charlotte, N.C.	71	66	60	−11	29	34	38	9
Columbus, Ohio	74	69	59	−15	26	31	39	13
Atlanta	38	15	8	−30	62	85	91	29
Palm Beach, Fla.	70	66	63	− 7	28	29	29	1
Nashville	76	71	65	−11	24	29	34	10
Anne Arundel Co., Md. (Annapolis)	86	86	84	− 2	14	13	14	0
Boston	68	52	35	−33	27	37	46	19
Fort Worth	67	55	44	−23	25	33	37	12
Indianapolis	66	57	49	−17	34	43	50	7
Mobile	58	55	56	− 2	42	45	43	1
Denver	66	54	41	−25	14	18	23	9
East Baton Rouge, La.	—	60	57	− 3	—	39	42	3
St. Louis	36	30	21	−15	64	70	79	15
El Paso	42	37	28	−16	3	3	4	1
Jefferson Parish, La.	78	74	66	−12	22	22	28	6
Granite, Utah (Salt Lake)	97	96	93	− 4	0	0.3	0.4	0.1
San Antonio	27	17	11	−16	15	16	15	0
Polk Co., Fla. (Bartow)	—	77	77	0	—	21	21	0
Virginia Beach, Va.	88	88	85	− 3	12	10	11	− 1
Newark, N.J.	18	11	9	− 9	72	72	71	− 1
Long Beach, Calif.	85	74	53	−32	8	13	19	11

District	White				Black			
	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80
Cobb Co., Ga. (Marietta)	97	97	96	− 1	3	3	3	0
Tucson, Ariz.	66	65	62	− 4	5	5	5	0
Austin	—	63	53	−10	—	15	19	4
Cincinnati	57	49	42	−15	43	51	57	14
Portland, Oregon	89	84	76	−13	8	12	14	6
Jefferson Co., Ala.	—	80	83	3	—	20	16	− 4
Tulsa	83	77	69	−14	12	17	23	9
Seattle	82	74	57	−25	11	16	22	6
San Francisco	41	28	17	−24	28	30	27	− 1
Oakland	31	20	14	−17	55	66	66	11
Buffalo	61	52	47	−14	37	43	47	10
Fresno	70	66	54	−16	9	10	12	3
Brevard Co., Fla. (Titusville)	—	87	84	− 3	—	12	14	2
Birmingham	49	37	24	−25	51	63	76	25
Caddo Parish, La.	—	48	45	− 3	—	51	55	4
San Juan, P.R.	—	94	91	− 3	—	1	2	1
Toledo, Ohio	71	66	62	− 9	27	30	33	5
Charleston, W. Va.	54	50	45	− 9	46	49	54	8
Wichita	85	78	72	−13	13	18	20	7
Pittsburgh	60	57	48	−12	39	43	52	13
Ysleta, Tex. (El Paso)	—	30	23	− 7	—	3	2	− 1
Omaha	80	77	70	−10	18	20	25	7
Minneapolis	89	81	68	−21	8	13	21	13
Escambia Co., Fla. (Pensacola)	—	71	70	− 1	—	28	27	− 1
Winston-Salem, N.C.	72	68	63	− 9	28	31	36	8
Oklahoma City	78	67	55	−23	28	28	35	7
Kanawha Co., W.Va.	—	93	92	− 1	—	7	7	0
Sacramento, Calif.	66	59	46	−20	14	18	22	8
Garden Grove, Calif.	89	84	69	−20	0	1	1	0
Akron	74	69	64	−10	26	30	35	9

(*continued*)

District	White				Black			
	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-80
Davis City, Utah	95	95	94	− 1	1	1	1	0
Kansas City, Mo.	53	38	28	−25	47	58	67	20
Norfolk, Va.	57	47	39	−18	42	51	58	16
Corpus Christi, Tex.	—	39	28	−11	—	6	6	0
Richardson, Tex.	95	—	90	− 5	4	—	5	1
St. Paul	91	86	74	−17	6	8	13	7
Pasadena, Calif.	94	87	71	−23	0	0	2	2
Anchorage	—	89	80	− 9	—	3	6	3
Volusia Co., Fla. (De Land)	—	79	78	− 1	—	21	20	− 1
Fulton Co., Ga.	89	—	67	−22	11	—	32	21
Cumberland Co., N.C. (Fayetteville)	—	69	62	− 7	—	26	33	7
Gwinnet Co., Ga.	95	—	97	2	5	—	2	− 3
Prince William Co., Va.	94	91	88	− 6	6	7	9	3
Fort Wayne, Ind.	—	81	77	− 4	—	17	20	3
Montgomery Co., Ala.	94	52	47	− 5	—	48	53	5
Calcasieu Parish, La.	—	73	73	0	—	27	27	0
Mt. Diablo U.S.D., Calif. (Contra Costra Co.)	94	93	86	− 8	0	1	2	1
Aldine, I.S.D., Tex. (Houston)	71	—	63	− 8	21	—	17	− 4
Shawnee Mission, Kan.	—	98	96	− 2	—	1	2	1
Gary, Ind.	29	19	8	−21	62	73	87	25
North East I.S.D., Tex. (San Antonio)	92	—	76	−16	0	—	3	3
Dayton City, Ohio	61	52	43	−18	38	48	57	19
Flint, Mich.	62	49	38	−24	37	49	59	22
Northside I.S.D., Tex. (San Antonio)	82	—	57	−25	0	—	4	4
San Jose, Calif.	68	71	64	− 4	1	2	2	1
Henrico Co., Va.	92	87	78	−14	8	12	20	12
Colorado Springs	—	84	82	− 2	—	6	6	0
Spring Branch I.S.D., Tex. (Houston)	99	96	81	−18	0	0	4	4
Jersey City	44	30	19	−25	—	47	48	1
Santa Ana, Calif.	63	—	21	−42	7	—	6	− 1

U.S.D.: Unified School District I.S.D.: Independent School District

Appendix C

Technical Notes

The basic computer work for this report was done by DBS Corporation under subcontract to Opportunity Systems, Inc., which prepared the data then submitted them for analysis by the Joint Center for Political Studies.

The *regions* used for analysis in this report include the following states:

SOUTH:	Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia
BORDER:	Delaware, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia
NORTHEAST:	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont
MIDWEST:	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin
WEST:	Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

Note: Hawaii and Alaska are excluded because of their unique ethnic compositions and distance from other states assigned to regions.

EXPOSURE INDICES

The tables reporting the racial average composition of schools attended by blacks, Hispanics, and whites were determined by calculations using the following algebraic formula, producing a figure commonly called an exposure index:

Exposure index showing typical exposure of white students to blacks in a school district:

$$E_{W/B} = \left(\sum_i \frac{W_i}{W_D} \times \left(\frac{b_i}{W_i + b_i} \right) \right) \times 100$$

W_i is the number of white students in the ith school

W_D is the number of white pupils in the district

b_i is the number of black pupils in the ith school

i stands for any given school, all of which must be examined in the construction of this index.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Strongly recommended books presenting background on the school desegregation struggle are Kluger (1975) and Weinberg (1977).
2. The judicial phase of this process is analyzed in Peltason (1961) and Sarratt (1966). The period of rapid change initiated in the South by the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is analyzed in Orfield (1969).
3. The situation in the early seventies was studied comprehensively by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, chaired by Senator Walter Mondale. The Committee's final report (Senate Select Committee 1972) outlines the major changes accompanying the onset of urban busing in the South. The federal statistics on desegregation progress were regularly released by the executive branch through the early seventies. Figures for the changes from 1970 to 1974, however, were produced in response to a request to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from Senators Edward Brooke and Jacob Javits and released on June 20, 1976, in a precursor to the present report. See Orfield (1977).
4. The word "white" as used in this report should be understood to mean non-Hispanic white, because Hispanics can be of any racial background and many are all or part white. The word "Anglo" would be more appropriate but is not used here because it is not widely used outside the Southwest.

Chapter 2

1. Although major researchers working on the white flight question strongly disagree on some other issues, there is general consensus on the point that city-suburban desegregation is most stable. See Rossell and Hawley (1981); Armor (1980); and Cataldo, Giles, and Gatlin (1978).

Chapter 4

1. The most important published work in this field is Carter and Segura (1979). The draft National Institute of Education report, *Public School Desegregation and the Hispanic Student,* by Oscar Uribe, Jr., summarizes the research to date and points to issues needing investigation. Unfortunately, there have been no major recent government or foundation grants for basic work on these issues.
2. Sources on metropolitan school desegregation include Cataldo, Giles and Gatlin (1983); Orfield (1978, Chapter 12); U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1977); and Pearce (1980). Voluntary city-suburban plans are in operation in a number of cities including Milwaukee, Boston, Hartford, Rochester, St. Louis, and Houston. For one recent discussion of the need for such approaches see Hentschke and Lowe (1983).
3. Recent court orders or consent decrees in St. Louis, Denver, Memphis, San Francisco, and Chicago have recognized the direct relationship between housing policy and school segregation. For a discussion of the relationship see Orfield (1981). Current fair housing law at the federal level provides no enforcement machinery except the initiation of litigation by the Justice Department. The Justice Department brought only three cases in the first two years of the Reagan Administration. Legislation creating additional enforcement power passed the House but was filibustered to death in the Senate in late 1980.

References

Armar, David J. "White Flight and the Future of School Desegregation." In *School Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future,* edited by Walter G. Stephan and Joe R. Feagin, p. 222. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Carter, Thomas P., and Segura, Roberto D. *Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1979.

Cataldo, Everett F.; Giles, Michael W.; and Gatlin, Douglas S. *School Desegregation Policy: Compliance, Avoidance, and the Metropolitan Remedy.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1978.

Coleman, James S., and Kelly, Sara D. "Education." In *The Urban Predicament,* edited by William Gorham and Nathan Glazer, pp. 252-253. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1976.

Crain, Robert L., and Mahard, Rita E. "Desegregation and Black Achievement: A Review of the Research." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 42 (1978):17-56.

_____. *Desegregation Plans that Raise Black Achievement: A Review of the Research.* Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corp., 1981.

_____. "MinorityAchievement: Policy Implications of Research." In *Effective School Desegregation,* edited by Willis D. Hawley, pp. 55-84. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

Hentschke, Guilbert C., and Lowe, William T. "Toward Increased Voluntary Interdistrict Integration in New York State." Report submitted to the Wilson Foundation by the University of Rochester, January 1983.

Killalea Associates, Inc. "Sample Selection for the 1980 Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey." Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, Contract HEW 100-78-0063, June 1980.

Kluger, Richard. *Simple Justice.* New York: Random House, 1975.

Orfield, Gary. *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

_____. *The Reconstruction of Southern Education: The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

_____. *Toward A Strategy for Urban Integration: Lessons in School and Housing Policy from Twelve Cities.* New York: Ford Foundation, 1981.

Pearce, Diana. "Breaking Down Barriers: New Evidence on the Impact of Metropolitan School Desegregation on Housing Patterns." Report submitted to the National Institute of Education, November 1980.

Peltason, J. W. *Fifty-Eight Lonely Men.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Rossell, Christine H., and Hawley, Willis D. "Understanding White Flight and Doing Something About It." In *Effective School Desegregation,* edited by Willis D. Hawley, pp. 157-184. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

Sarratt, Reed. *The Ordeal of Desegregation.* New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Statement on Metropolitan School Desegregation.* 1977.

U.S., Senate, Committee on Human Resources. *Desegregation and the Cities—The Trends and the Policy Choices.* 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977.

U.S., Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. *Toward Equal Educational Opportunity.* 92d Cong., 2d sess., 1972.

Weinberg, Meyer. A *Chance to Learn: A History of Race and Education in the United States.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Joint Center for Political Studies
Board of Governors

William B. Boyd
President
Johnson Foundation
Racine, Wisconsin

Kenneth B. Clark
President
Clark, Phipps, Clark & Harris
New York, New York

Hortense Williams Dixon
Houston, Texas

The Hon. Mervyn Dymally
U.S. House of Representatives
Compton, California

Wendell Freeland, Esquire
Chairman
Freeland & Kronz
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Jayne Brumley Ikard
Washington, D.C.

Louis E. Martin
Assistant Vice-President for
Communications
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Percy E. Sutton
Chairman of the Board
Inner City Broadcasting
Corporation
New York, New York

Eddie N. Williams
President
Joint Center for Political
Studies
Washington, D.C.

James D. Wolfensohn
James D. Wolfensohn, Inc.
New York, New York

Eleanor Farrar, Secretary to
the Board
Vice-President
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C.

Selected JCPS Publications

Black Americans and the Shaping of U.S. Foreign Policy: Proceedings of a JCPS Roundtable, 1981. ISBN 0-941410-18-8. $4.95

Black Elected Officials and their Constituencies, Thomas E. Cavanagh and Denise Stockton, 1983. ISBN 0-941410-28-5. $4.95.

Black Politics 1980, JCPS Office of Research, 1980.

A Guide to the Democratic National Convention. ISBN 0-941410-11-0. $4.95.

A Guide to the Republican National Convention. ISBN 0-941410-12-9. $4.95.

Blacks on the Move: A Decade of Demographic Change, William P. O'Hare, Jane-yu Li, Roy Chatterjee, and Margaret Shukur, abridged by Phillip Sawicki, 1982. ISBN 0-941410-25-0. $4.95.

The Changing Patterns of Black Family Income, Henry E. Felder, 1983. ISBN 0-941410-31-5, $4.95.

Energy and Equity: Some Social Concerns, edited by Ellis Cose, 1979. ISBN 0-941410-09-9. $8.50.

Energy and the Urban Crisis, Ellis Cose, 1978. ISBN 0-941410-08-0. $4.95.

FOCUS, JCPS monthly newsletter. $12.00 per annum.

Foreign Trade Policy and Black Economic Advancement: Proceedings of a JCPS Roundtable, 1981. ISBN 0-941410-19-6. $4.95.

How to Use Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, third edition, Barbara Y. Phillips, 1983. ISBN 0-941410-27-7. $4.95

National Roster of Black Elected Officials, 1982, volume 12, ISSN 0092- $23.00.

The Nineteen Eighties: Prologue and Prospect, Kenneth B. Clark and John Hope Franklin, 1981. ISBN 0-941410-20-X. $2.95.

Picking a President: A Guide to Delegate Selection in the States, JCPS Office of Research, 1980. ISBN 0-941410-15-3. $4.95.

A Policy Framework for Racial Justice, 1980. Statement by thirty black scholars; introduction by Kenneth B. Clark and John Hope Franklin. ISBN 0-941410-30-7. $4.95.

Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980, Gary Orfield, 1983. ISBN 0-941410-29-3. $4.95.

Vote Dilution, Minority Voting Rights, and the Courts, Stephen L. Wasby, 1982. ISBN 0-941410-22-6. $4.95.

The Voting Rights Act and Black Electoral Participation, Kenneth H. Thompson, 1982. ISBN 0-941410-24-2. $4.95.

The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the political process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs.